

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of one drawing includes a replacement drawing for Fig. 7. In replacement Fig. 7, the figure is indicated as --Prior Art--.

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to Fig 7; and rejected claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,011,519 to Sadler et al. ("*Sadler*"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0190906 to Kim et al. ("*Kim*").

Applicants have amended claim 1. Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 remain pending.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, Applicants have attached a replacement drawing sheet for Fig 7 that indicates that Fig. 7 is --Prior Art--. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Sadler* and *Kim*, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites a data communication apparatus including, for example:

a loop coil antenna arranged so that at least a portion of a conductor extends along the peripheral of lateral surfaces, said lateral surfaces forming said enclosure with the exclusion of both major surfaces of enclosure

(emphasis added). *Sadler* does not teach or suggest every element of claim 1.

Sadler discloses "an internal antenna for mobile terminals that provides performance comparable with externally mounted antennas" (col. 1, lines 42-44). The

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Examiner correctly states that *Sadler* “does not disclose the loop antenna is a three-dimensional shape and extends along the lateral surfaces of an enclosure” (Office Action at page 3). Therefore, *Sadler* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, “a loop coil antenna arranged so that at least a portion of a conductor extends along the peripheral of lateral surfaces, said lateral surfaces forming said enclosure with the exclusion of both major surfaces of enclosure,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner relies on *Kim* to allegedly disclose “a coil loop antenna having three-dimensional shape and extends along lateral surfaces of an enclosure” (Office Action at page 3). Even assuming that this is correct, which Applicants do not concede, *Kim* does not cure the deficiencies of *Sadler*.

Kim discloses “a helical conductor in the shape of a dipole structure inside of a ceramic chip” (paragraph 0008). As shown in Figs. 4 and 5, helical conductors 110 and 120 are located within a ceramic chip main body 100. Helical conductors 110 and 120 do not extend “along the peripheral of lateral surfaces.” Therefore, *Kim* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, “a loop coil antenna arranged so that at least a portion of a conductor extends along the peripheral of lateral surfaces, said lateral surfaces forming said enclosure with the exclusion of both major surfaces of enclosure,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Sadler* and *Kim* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, at least because the references fail to teach each and every element of the claim. Claim 1 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons presented

above. Claims 3-5, 7, and 9-12 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejection. Pending claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 3, 2007

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220

Attachments:

(1) Replacement Drawing Sheet (1 page)